

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 12 are amended. Claims 1-20, as amended, remain in the application. No new matter is added by the amendments to the drawings and the claims.

The Rejections:

In the Office Action dated October 19, 2005, the Examiner objected to the title of the invention as not descriptive.

The present invention concerns a device and a method by which remote maintenance functions are stored, extracted, selected, activated and deactivated in a corresponding data memory in an elevator installation from a remote location. Thus, the original title "DEVICE AND METHOD FOR REMOTE MAINTENANCE OF AN ELEVATOR" is descriptive of the invention. If the Examiner has a suggestion for more descriptive wording, Applicants would be pleased to consider it.

The Examiner objected to the drawings because the blank rectangular boxes and/or merely numbered boxes of Figs. 1 and 4 must be labeled. Submitted herewith are proposed drawing amendments to Figs. 1 and 4 for approval by the Examiner.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-5 and 11-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hummert et al. (3973648). The Examiner stated that Hummert et al. teaches in figures 1-9, a monitoring system for an elevator.

Regarding Claims 1 and 12, the Examiner stated that the elevator system 28 for multiple buildings A-C contains a monitoring and maintenance control interface 26, which has inputs for control (figure 8) as well as sensor inputs (figure 9), which provides an output to modem 24 and over communications network to a remote cpu 12. The Examiner further stated that processor 30 (processor 174, memory 172) is associated with interface 26 and temperature 304 is one of the monitored elements.

Regarding Claim 2, the Examiner stated that the system processor allows for programming.

Regarding Claim 3, the Examiner stated that the system processor evaluates the selected sensor or function.

000132702\0097\671445-1

Regarding Claim 4, the Examiner noted the transducers 302, 304, 306, 308 and the auxiliary inputs 250.

Regarding Claim 5, the Examiner noted 252, 298 S/P receiver and latch.

Regarding Claims 11 and 17, the Examiner noted the controller 18 and the processor 16.

Regarding Claims 12 and 13, the Examiner stated that the sensors/controls are individually monitored and selected.

Regarding Claim 14, the Examiner noted 15, 24.

Regarding Claims 15 and 18, the Examiner stated that the selection can be run during use.

Regarding Claim 16, the Examiner stated that the system provides remote diagnosis, repair among a few.

Regarding Claim 19, the Examiner stated that monitoring can be scheduled.

Regarding Claim 20, the Examiner noted 252, 254.

The Examiner rejected Claims 6-10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hummert et al and Applicants' admitted prior art. The Examiner stated that Hummert et al does not illustrate the specific details of the interface units but states that standard unit are utilized. The Examiner noted that Applicants state on page 4 of the instant specification that the number and kind of interface units is variable and easily configured; thus, the particular type of interface is considered a matter of convenience.

The Cited References:

Hummert et al. shows a monitoring system for off-site monitoring, traffic study and/or trouble shooting of elevator installations. The remote monitoring site includes visual display means for displaying the operation of the selected elevator installation in real time, means for storing and analyzing status signals from the elevator installation, as well as for printing out the results of such an analysis, and control means for entering commands to be executed by the elevator system. In addition to observing the operation of the complete elevator installation, any combination of software and/or hardware at the elevator installation may be selectively monitored by substituting a system processor and/or simulated car controllers, both of which are located at the monitoring site, for those located at the elevator installation, and operating selected components at the elevator installation along with those at the monitoring site via the

0001327020097671445-1

communication link. The operation of the resulting hybrid system including its response to commands initiated at the monitoring site may be displayed and/or analyzed, as desired.

The Response:

Applicants amended Claims 1 and 12 to clarify that a set of remote maintenance functions are stored in a device at the elevator installation and selectively activated from a remote location. While it is known to remotely monitor and control elevator installations, as shown by Hummert et al., the prior art does not show or suggest storing the maintenance functions at the elevator installation and remotely selecting the functions to be performed as claimed.

Hummert et al. shows a monitoring and maintenance control interface 26. The operation of the interface 26 is described in Column 10, at Lines 31-49, as being responsive to calls from the central monitoring location to read information in the memory of the system processor 30 and to deliver commands to the elevator control to operate selected components. While the Hummert et al. system can remotely diagnose problems that require maintenance, the system does not store maintenance functions at the elevator installation. Applicants' claimed device can be used with different elevator installations simply by changing the remote maintenance function set and determining which sensors to connect to the device inputs.

The Examiner stated that the prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure. The Examiner cited: U.S. Patent No. 4,106,593 issued to Otto et al.; U.S. Patent No. 4,512,442 issued to Moore et al.; U.S. Patent No. Moore et al. issued to; U.S. Patent No. 5,557,546 issued to Fukai et al.; U.S. Patent No. 5,817,994 issued to Fried et al.; and JP Publication 06171855 A. The Examiner stated that Fried et al., Moore et al., Otto et al., and Asahi et al. are cited to illustrate similar elevator monitoring systems with remote monitoring. Applicants reviewed these references and found them to be no more pertinent than the prior art relied upon by the Examiner in the rejections.

In view of the amendments to the claims and the above arguments, Applicants believe that the claims of record now define patentable subject matter over the art of record. Accordingly, an early Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

000132702\0097\671445-1